

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner entering applicant's submission, filed on May 3, 2004. Claims 1-28 stand pending, no new claims have been added or deleted.

Claims 1-28 stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.114 on the grounds that acronyms need to be spelled out. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 3, 8-11, 17, 21-24 and 26 have been amended to remove acronyms, and to define applicant's invention. Applicant believes the changes to these claims makes explicit that which applicant believed to be already implicit and, therefore, are not made for statutory purposes related to patentability.

Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington (U.S. Patent No. 5,895,454) in view of Barlow et al. ("Barlow", U.S. Patent No. 6,038,551). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant's claim 1 defines an asset tracking, managing and servicing system that, in accordance with a "user-referenced subsystem," a "control-communication subsystem" and a plurality of databases, enables the tracking of user-based assets, and enables the managing of servicing for user-based assets for each of a plurality of users. Using the asset tracking, managing and servicing system of applicant's claim 1, vendors can initiate interactions between user-referenced and vendor-referenced data records. Enabling vendors (and users) to initiate interactions in manner that creates current user information effectively provides for asset tracking, managing and servicing.

Harrington teaches an integrated environment to effect commerce (column 2, line 23). Harrington teaches organizing and integrating commercial interactions via a remote database application whereby a user accesses a database to locate and interact with a range of remote vendor locations. In particular, information stored in the database "directs" the user to vendor web sites, always in response to a user initiated activity, such as a keyword search, an interaction with a graphical icon, selection of screen controls or the like. Harrington, in contrast with applicant's claim 1, does not teach or suggest tracking user-based assets, nor does it teach managing the servicing of user-based assets for each of a plurality of users. Further, Harrington does not teach or suggest enabling vendor based interactions between user-based records and

vendor-based records. Nowhere in Harrington is a vendor able to “initiate” an interaction between asset and relationship tracking repository data records that are user-referenced and the at least one of a service and product, vendor-referenced data records that are vendor-referenced, in a manner that creates current user information. Instead, Harrington teaches a database that stores vendor data 32 and which is used to link customers to vendor sites to review vendor data 36 stored therein to effect financial transactions. Thus, fundamental elements of applicant’s claim 1 are missing from the teachings of Harrington, including asset tracking, managing and servicing.

Applicant respectfully submits that Barlow does not supply the elements of applicant’s claim 1 that are missing from the teachings of Harrington. Barlow describes a system and method for configuring and managing security resources on a multi-purpose integrated circuit smartcard using a personal computer. Barlow teaches that a user maintains information about their personal assets or other aspects of their lives on an intelligent PC card which can be connected to a computer to monitor and update its contents, or to a remote computer. Barlow, however, does not teach or suggest applicant’s claim 1 control-communication subsystem that enables a vendor able to “initiate” an interaction between asset and relationship tracking repository data records in a manner that creates current user information, and enables tracking the user-based assets and managing servicing for the user-based assets for each of the plurality of users.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Harrington and Barlow does not teach all of the elements of applicant’s claim 1 and, therefore, does not render applicant’s claim 1 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-28 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and are not, therefore, patentable for the same reasons, as well as because of the combination of features in those claims set forth the with the combination of features set forth in the claim(s) from which they depend.

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, for which action is earnestly solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on August 25, 2005:

Max Moskowitz
Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

August 25, 2005
Date of Signature

MM:JJF:ck

Respectfully submitted,

Max Moskowitz
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700